



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,394

04/04/2005

Eric Verschuere

234854

5786

23460

7590

03/07/2006

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD  
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900  
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE  
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

ZIMMERMAN, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/530,394	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VERSCHUEREN, ERIC	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joshua D. Zimmerman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/04/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 9 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 9, line 4 and claim 26 line 4 contain the same spelling error. --rage-- should be --rate--. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 13 appears to be just a recitation of claim 3. For purposes of examination, dependent claims 35-37 are assumed to be dependent from claim 3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 14, 38, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 14 and claims 38-40, which depend from claim 14, require that the heating step be done by either IR or microwave radiation. However, claim 3, from which claim 14 depends, allows only for hot air or steam to be used. Accordingly, claims 14 and 38-40 could not be examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamitani (US 2002/0098288).

Regarding claim 1, Kamitani teaches “a method of making a heat-sensitive lithographic printing plate precursor (paragraph 11) comprising the steps of

(i) providing a web of a lithographic support having a hydrophilic surface (paragraph 12 and paragraph 47, lines 13-15);

(ii) applying a coating comprising a phenolic resin on the hydrophilic surface of the web (paragraph 51);

(iii) drying the coating (paragraph 12);

(iv) a heating step wherein the web temperature is maintained above 150°C during a period of between 0.1 and 60 seconds (paragraph 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> example from the bottom of table 1); and

(v) winding the precursor on a core or cutting the precursor into sheets (paragraph 70)."

Regarding claim 5, Kamitani further teaches "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 6, Kamitani further teaches "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

Regarding claim 4, Kamitani further teaches "wherein the heating step is carried out by exposing the precursor to infrared or microwave radiation (paragraphs 33 and 37)."

Regarding claim 17, Kamitani further teaches "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 22, Kamitani further teaches "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 8, 10 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani.

Kamitani teaches all that is claimed in claims 5, 6 and 22, as discussed above.

Regarding claims 7 and 23, Kamitani does not specifically teach "wherein said average cooling rate is at least 0.5°C/s." However, Kamitani does teach the use of a forced cooling system (paragraph 39) in conjunction with a continuous web-type system (figure 1). The exact cooling rate is not disclosed, but this is a rapid cooling system (paragraph 41) similar to the system claimed by applicant (page 8, lines 3-7 of applicant's disclosure). Further, Kamitani teaches the desire to have a short cooling time in order to decrease the time until an overcoat layer can be applied (last sentence of paragraph 39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to set the cooling rate at a rate higher than 0.5°C/s in order to achieve a quick cooling time in order to prepare the precursor for an overcoat.

Regarding claims 8, 24 and 25, applicant admits the T<sub>g</sub> of phenolic resins to be between 75°C and 95°C (page 10, lines 5-7 of applicant's disclosure). Kamitani discloses cooling from temperatures above 95°C (Table 1 and Table 2) to temperatures below 75°C (paragraph 41). The exact cooling rate is not disclosed, but this is a rapid cooling system (paragraph 41) similar to the system claimed by applicant (page 8, lines 3-7 of applicant's disclosure). Further, Kamitani teaches the ability change the cooling time to meet process needs (last sentence of paragraph 39). Also, it is an inherent property of polymer processing that cooling too quickly from a temperature above the T<sub>g</sub> to a temperature below the T<sub>g</sub> results in voids and/or other defects in the polymer microstructure, thus deteriorating the polymer stability. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to make the cooling rate less than 10°C/s in order to prevent the formation of voids and/or other defects, so as to enhance the stability of the polymer in the printing plate precursor.

Regarding claim 10, Kamitani further teaches "T1 is Tg+20°C and T2 is Tg-20°C (paragraph 41 and table 1 and table 2. The high temperatures are 20 degrees higher than Tg and the low temperatures are 20 degrees lower than Tg).

4. Claims 3, 16, 19, 21, 35, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kojima et al. (US 5,380,612).

Regarding claim 3, Kamitani does not specifically teach "wherein the heating step is carried out by blowing hot air or steam onto the precursor." However, Kamitani does suggest it is possible to use hot air to heat the printing plate (paragraph 37, lines 2-3). Further, Kojima et al. teach the equivalence of hot air heaters to infrared heaters (column 10, lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a hot air heater in place of the heater of Kamitani to save money by using existing hot air heaters.

Regarding claim 16, Kamitani further disclose "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 19, Kamitani further disclose "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

Regarding claim 35, Kamitani further disclose "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 36, Kamitani further disclose "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

5. Claims 21 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani in view of Kojima et al. as applied to claims 3, 16, 19, 35 and 36 above.

Regarding claims 21 and 37, Kamitani in view of Kojima et al. does not specifically teach "wherein said average cooling rate is at least 0.5°C/s." However, Kamitani does teach the use of a forced cooling system (paragraph 39) in conjunction with a continuous web-type system (figure 1). The exact cooling rate is not disclosed, but this is a rapid cooling system (paragraph 41) similar to the system claimed by applicant (page 8, lines 3-7 of applicant's disclosure). Further, Kamitani teaches the desire to have a short cooling time in order to decrease the time until an overcoat layer can be applied (last sentence of paragraph 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to set the cooling rate at a higher than 0.5°C/s in order to achieve a quick cooling time in order to prepare the precursor for an overcoat.



6. Claims 9, 26, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani, as applied to claims 8, 24 and 25 above, in view of Price (6,007,240).

Regarding claims 9, 26 and 27, Kamitani does not specifically disclose three different phases. However, it is an inherent property of polymer processing that cooling too quickly from a temperature above the  $T_g$  to a temperature below the  $T_g$  results in voids and/or other defects in the polymer microstructure, thus deteriorating the polymer stability. It is also a property of the glass transition region that polymer relaxation effects are stronger than above or below the transition region. Price teaches this fact (column 5, lines 63-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have a slower cooling rate in the glass transition region in order to reduce the formation of voids and/or other defects, so as to enhance both the microstructure and the stability of the polymer in the printing plate precursor.

Regarding the further limitation of a cooling rate of at least  $10^\circ\text{C/s}$  in the first and third phases, Kamitani teaches the desire to have a short cooling time in order to decrease the time until an overcoat layer can be applied (last sentence of paragraph 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to set the cooling rate at a rate higher than  $10^\circ\text{C/s}$  in these regions in order to achieve a quick cooling time in order to prepare the precursor for an overcoat.

Regarding claim 28, Kamitani further teaches "T1 is  $T_g + 20^\circ\text{C}$  and T2 is  $T_g - 20^\circ\text{C}$  (paragraph 41 and table 1 and table 2. The high temperatures are 20 degrees higher than  $T_g$  and the low temperatures are 20 degrees lower than  $T_g$ ).

7. Claims 2, 12, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani as applied to claim 1 above, in view of McCullough et al. (WO 99/21715). Kamitani teaches all that is claimed in claim 1, as discussed above. Kamitani does not specifically teach "wherein during the heating step the web temperature is maintained above  $170^\circ\text{C}$  during a period of between 1 and 30 seconds." Kamitani does suggest the ability to vary the temperature and time conditions in order to achieve desired results (see, for example, Table 1 and Table 2). McCullough et al. teach a method of heating a printing plate precursor (abstract). Further, McCullough et al. teach the desire and ability to vary, by trial and error, the time and temperature settings to achieve desired sensitivity in the printing plate precursors (page 7, lines 23-24 and lines 33-34). McCullough et al. also teach that when the printing plate precursors are heated to a higher temperature, the precursors should be held at that temperature for a shorter time (see the sentence bridging pages 7 and 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to maintain the temperature of the precursors above  $170^\circ\text{C}$  for a period of between 1 and 30 seconds in order to achieve a desired sensitivity.

Regarding claim 12, Kamitani further teaches "wherein the heating step is carried out by exposing the precursor to infrared or microwave radiation (paragraphs 33 and 37)."

Regarding claim 30, Kamitani further teaches "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 32, Kamitani further teaches "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

8. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani in view of McCullough et al. as applied to claims 2, 12, 30 and 32 above.

Kamitani in view of McCullough et al. fails to specifically teach "wherein said average cooling rate is at least 0.5°C/s." However, Kamitani does teach the use of a forced cooling system (paragraph 39) in conjunction with a continuous web-type system (figure 1). The exact cooling rate is not disclosed, but this is a rapid cooling system (paragraph 41) similar to the system claimed by applicant (page 8, lines 3-7 of applicant's disclosure). Further, Kamitani teaches the desire to have a short cooling time in order to decrease the time until an overcoat layer can be applied (last sentence of paragraph 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to set the cooling rate at a rate higher than 0.5°C/s in order to achieve a quick cooling time in order to prepare the precursor for an overcoat.

9. Claims 11, 15, 18, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani in view of McCullough as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Kojima et al. (US 5,380,612).

Regarding claim 11, Kamitani does not specifically teach "wherein the heating step is carried out by blowing hot air or steam onto the precursor." However, Kamitani does suggest it is possible to use hot air to heat the printing plate (paragraph 37, lines 2-3). Further, Kojima et al. teach the equivalence of hot air heaters to infrared heaters (column 10, lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a hot air heater in place of the heater of Kamitani to save money by using existing hot air heaters.

Regarding claim 29, Kamitani further teaches "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 31, Kamitani further disclose "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

Regarding claim 15, Kamitani further teaches "further comprising a cooling step between step (iv) and step (v) (paragraph 38)."

Regarding claim 18, Kamitani further teaches "wherein during the cooling step the web temperature of the precursor is reduced at an average cooling rate which is higher than if the precursor would be kept under ambient conditions (paragraph 39)."

10. Claims 20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamitani in view of McCullough et al. further in view of Kojima et al. as applied to claims 11, 29 and 31 above.

Regarding claims 20 and 33, Kamitani in view of McCullough et al. further in view of Kojima et al. does not specifically teach "wherein said average cooling rate is at least 0.5°C/s." However, Kamitani does teach the use of a forced cooling system (paragraph 39) in conjunction with a continuous web-type system (figure 1). The exact cooling rate is not disclosed, but this is a rapid cooling system (paragraph 41) similar to the system claimed by applicant (page 8, lines 3-7 of applicant's disclosure). Further, Kamitani teaches the desire to have a short cooling time in order to decrease the time until an overcoat layer can be applied (last sentence of paragraph 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, through routine experimentation, to set the cooling rate at a rate higher than 0.5°C/s in order to achieve a quick cooling time in order to prepare the precursor for an overcoat.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-2749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30A - 6:00P, Alternate Fridays 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joshua D Zimmerman  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2854

jdz



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800